

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Phillip Andrew Bridges, # 347312,	)	
	)	C/A No.: 6:12-cv-01198-GRA-JDA
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
Simpsonville Police Dept. Agency;	)	<b>ORDER</b>
Jimmy Dale Logan; Blaine Hudson, and	)	
Aaron Edwards, all sued Individually and	)	
in their Official Capacities,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

This matter comes before the Court for review of United States Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin's Report and Recommendation made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., and filed on June 1, 2012. Plaintiff commenced this action on May 4, 2012, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On June 13, 2012, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Appoint Counsel. Under established local procedure in this judicial district, Magistrate Judge Austin made a careful review of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915, 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act. Magistrate Judge Austin recommends that this Court dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint without prejudice. This Court adopts the magistrate's recommendation in its entirety.

Plaintiff brings this claim *pro se*. This Court is required to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally. Such pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). This Court is charged with liberally construing a pleading filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow

for the development of a potentially meritorious claim. *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982).

The magistrate makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). This Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and this Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This Court may also "receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate with instructions." *Id.* In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198 (4th. Cir. 1983). Plaintiff has filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation and the time for filing such objections has lapsed.

After a review of the record, this Court finds that the magistrate's Report and Recommendation accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is accepted and adopted in its entirety.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Complaint is DISMISSED without prejudice.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Appoint Counsel is DENIED as moot.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G. Ross Anderson, Jr.", is written over a horizontal line.

G. Ross Anderson, Jr.  
Senior United States District Judge

June 29, 2012  
Anderson, South Carolina

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Plaintiff has the right to appeal this Order within thirty (30) days from the date of the entry of this Order, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. Failure to meet this deadline, as modified by Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, will waive the right to appeal.